

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BRADLEY MARSHALL,) Case No. CV-11-5319 SC
Plaintiff,)
v.) ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,) RECONSIDERATION REGARDING
et al.,) SANCTIONS AND STAY PENDING
Defendants.) APPEAL

)

On November 30, 2012, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff Bradley Marshall's motion for leave to proceed with an adversary complaint against Defendant Washington State Bar Association ("WSBA") in bankruptcy court and sanctioned Mr. Marshall for unreasonably multiplying proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927. ECF No. 100 ("Nov. 30 Order"). The Court found that Mr. Marshall's adversary complaint fell within the scope of the Court's May 23, 2012 Pre-Filing Order ("May 23 Order") and that the adversary complaint raised arguments which had been rejected by numerous courts in similar collateral attacks filed by Mr. Marshall in the last several years. Id. Mr. Marshall now moves the Court to reconsider the November 30 Order and to stay the award of

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 sanctions as well as his bankruptcy proceedings pending his appeal
2 of the Court's May 23 Order. ECF No. 111 ("Mot.").

3 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and are ordinarily
4 denied "in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior
5 ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
6 have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with
7 reasonable diligence." Civ. Local Rule 7(h)(1). Mr. Marshall has
8 failed to show any manifest error. Indeed, Mr. Marshall's motion
9 does not challenge the Court's finding that his adversary complaint
10 merely repeats arguments that were rejected in past collateral
11 attacks. Nor does the motion point to any new facts or legal
12 authority which could not have been cited earlier. Accordingly,
13 Mr. Marshall's motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

14 The Court also declines to stay the bankruptcy proceedings and
15 the award of sanctions. Mr. Marshall has offered no authority or
16 explanation as to why such a stay would be necessary or
17 appropriate.

18 For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Marshall's motion for
19 reconsideration and request to stay pending appeal are DENIED.
20

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22
23 Dated: December 10, 2012


24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26
27
28